

1
2
3
4
5
6 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
7 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
8 AT SEATTLE

9 RONNIE G. WILCOWSKI,

10 Plaintiff,

Case No. 3:16-CV-05001-RBL-BAT

11 v.

12 CAROLYN W. COLVIN, Acting Commissioner
13 of
14 Social Security,

15 Defendant.

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

51

52

53

54

55

56

57

58

59

60

61

62

63

64

65

66

67

68

69

70

71

72

73

74

75

76

77

78

79

80

81

82

83

84

85

86

87

88

89

90

91

92

93

94

95

96

97

98

99

100

101

102

103

104

105

106

107

108

109

110

111

112

113

114

115

116

117

118

119

120

121

122

123

124

125

126

127

128

129

130

131

132

133

134

135

136

137

138

139

140

141

142

143

144

145

146

147

148

149

150

151

152

153

154

155

156

157

158

159

160

161

162

163

164

165

166

167

168

169

170

171

172

173

174

175

176

177

178

179

180

181

182

183

184

185

186

187

188

189

190

191

192

193

194

195

196

197

198

199

200

201

202

203

204

205

206

207

208

209

210

211

212

213

214

215

216

217

218

219

220

221

222

223

224

225

226

227

228

229

230

231

232

233

234

235

236

237

238

239

240

241

242

243

244

245

246

247

248

249

250

251

252

253

254

255

256

257

258

259

260

261

262

263

264

265

266

267

268

269

270

271

272

273

274

275

276

277

278

279

280

281

282

283

284

285

286

287

288

289

290

291

292

293

294

295

296

297

298

299

300

301

302

303

304

305

306

307

308

309

310

311

312

313

314

315

316

317

318

319

320

321

322

323

324

325

326

327

328

329

330

331

332

333

334

335

336

337

338

339

340

341

342

343

344

345

346

347

348

349

350

351

352

353

354

355

356

357

358

359

360

361

362

363

364

365

366

367

368

369

370

371

372

373

374

375

376

377

378

379

380

381

382

383

384

385

386

387

388

389

390

391

392

393

394

395

396

397

398

399

400

401

402

403

404

405

406

407

408

409

410

411

412

413

414

415

416

417

418

419

420

421

422

423

424

425

426

427

428

429

430

431

432

433

434

435

436

437

438

439

440

441

442

443

444

445

446

447

448

449

450

451

452

453

454

455

456

457

458

459

460

461

462

463

464

465

466

467

468

469

470

471

472

473

474

475

476

477

478

479

480

481

482

483

484

485

486

487

488

489

490

491

492

493

494

495

496

497

498

499

500

501

502

503

504

505

506

507

508

509

510

511

512

513

514

515

516

517

518

519

520

521

522

523

524

525

526

527

528

529

530

531

532

533

534

535

536

537

538

539

540

541

542

543

544

545

546

547

548

549

550

551

552

553

554

555

556

557

558

559

560

561

562

563

564

565

566

567

568

569

570

571

572

573

574

575

576

577

578

579

580

581

582

583

584

585

586

587

588

589

590

591

592

593

594

595

596

597

598

599

600

601

602

603

604

605

606

607

608

609

610

611

612

613

614

615

616

617

618

619

620

621

622

623

624

625

626

627

628

629

630

631

632

633

634

635

636

637

638

639

640

641

642

643

644

645

646

647

648

649

650

651

652

653

654

655

656

657

658

659

660

661

662

663

664

665

666

667

668

669

670

671

672

673

674

675

676

677

678

679

680

681

682

683

684

685

686

687

688

689

690

691

692

693

694

695

696

697

698

699

700

701

702

703

704

705

706

707

708

709

710

711

712

713

714

715

716

717

718

719

720

721

722

723

724

725

726

727

728

729

730

731

732

733

734

735

736

737

738

739

740

741

742

743

744

745

746

747

748

749

750

751

752

753

754

755

756

757

758

759

760

761

762

763

764

765

766

767

768

769

770

771

772

773

774

775

776

777

778

779

780

781

782

783

784

785

786

787

788

789

790

791

792

793

794

795

796

797

798

799

800

801

802

803

804

805

806

807

808

809

810

811

812

813

814

815

816

817

818

819

820

821

822

823

824

825

826

827

828

829

830

831

832

833

834

835

836

837

838

839

840

841

842

843

844

845

846

847

848

849

850

851

852

853

854

855

856

857

858

859

860

861

862

863

864

865

866

867

868

869

870

871

872

873

874

875

876

877

878

879

880

881

882

883

884

885

886

887

888

889

890

891

892

893

894

895

896

897

898

899

900

901

902

903

904

905

906

907

908

909

910

911

912

913

914

915

916

917

918

919

920

921

922

923

924

925

926

927

928

929

930

931

932

933

934

935

936

937

938

939

940

941

942

943

944

945

946

947

948

949

950

951

952

953

954

955

956

957

958

959

960

961

962

963

964

965

966

967

968

969

970

971

972

973

974

975

976

977

978

979

980

981

982

983

984

985

986

987

988

989

990

991

992

993

994

995

996

997

998

999

1000

1001

1002

1003

1004

1005

1006

1007

1008

1009

1010

1011

1012

1013

1014

1015

1016

1017

1018

1019

1020

1021

1022

1023

1024

1025

1026

1027

1028

1029

1030

1031

1032

1033

1034

1035

1036

1037

1038

1039

1040

1041

1042

1043

1044

1045

1046

1047

1048

1049

1050

1051

1052

1053

1054

1055

1056

1057

1058

1059

1060

1061

1062

1063

1064

1065

1066

1067

1068

1069

1070

1071

1072

1073

1074

1075

1076

1077

1078

1079

1080

1081

1082

1083

1084

1085

1086

1087

1088

1089

1090

1091

1092

1093

1094

1095

1096

1097

1098

1099

1100

1101

1102

1103

1104

1105

1106

1107

1108

1109

1110

1111

1112

1113

1114

1115

1116

1117

1118

1119

1120

1121

1122

1123

1124

1125

1126

1127

1128

1129

1130

1131

1132

1133

1134

1135

1136

1137

1138

1139

1140

1141

1142

1143

1144

1145

1146

1147

1148

1149

1150

1151

1152

1153

1154

1155

1156

1157

1158

1159

1160

1161

1162

1163

1164

1165

1166

1167

1168

1169

1170

1171

1172

1173

1174

1175

1176

1177

1178

1179

1180

1181

1182

1183

1184

1185

1186

1187

1188

1189

1190

1191

1192

1193

1194

1195

1196

1197

1198

1199

1200

1201

1202

1203

1204

1205

1206

1207

1208

1209

1210

1211

1212

1213

1214

1215

1216

1217

1218

1219

1220

1221

1222

1223

1224

1225

1226

1227

1228

1229

1230

1231

1232

1233

1234

1235

1236

1237

1238

1239

1240

1241

1242

1243

1244

1245

1246

1247

1248

1249

1250

1251

1252

1253

1254

1255

1256

1257

1258

1259

1260

1261

1262

1263

1264

1265

1266

1267

1268

1269

1270

1271

1272

1273

1274

1275

1276

1277

1278

1279

1280

1281

1282

1283

1284

1285

1286

1287

1288

1289

1290

1291

1292

1293

1294

1295

1296

1297

1298

1299

1300

1301

1302

1303

1304

1305

1306

1307

1308

1309

1310

1311

1312

1313

1314

1315

1316

1317

1318

1319

1320

1321

1322

1323

1324

1325

1326

1327

1328

1329

1330

1331

1332

1333

1334

1335

1336

1337

1338

1339

1340

1341

1342

1343

1344

1345

1346

1347

1348

1349

1350

1351

1352

1353

13

1 applications were denied initially and on reconsideration. Tr. 19. The ALJ conducted a hearing
 2 on March 31, 2014, finding Mr. Wilcowski not disabled. Tr. 30.

3 Utilizing the five-step disability evaluation process,¹ the ALJ found Mr. Wilcowski met
 4 the insured status requirements through December 31, 2014; had not engaged in substantial
 5 gainful activity since his alleged onset date; and that he has severe impairments of attention
 6 deficit hyperactivity disorder (ADHD), bipolar disorder, and personality disorder. Tr. 21-22.
 7 The ALJ found Mr. Wilcowski had the residual functional capacity (“RFC”) to perform a full
 8 range of work with the following nonexertional limitations: he could understand, remember, and
 9 carry out simple, routine and repetitive tasks; he was limited to occasional superficial interaction
 10 with the general public and coworkers; and he is able to adapt to simple variation in routine. Tr.
 11 24. The ALJ also found Mr. Wilcowski could perform his past relevant work as a commercial
 12 cleaner and bag sewer, and in the alternative, he could perform other jobs that exist in significant
 13 numbers in the national economy. Tr. 28-29. As the Appeals Council denied Mr. Wilcowski’s
 14 request for review, the ALJ’s decision is the Commissioner’s final decision. Tr. 1-6.

15 DISCUSSION

16 A. Mr. Wilcowski’s Credibility Finding Should Be Affirmed

17 Mr. Wilcowski contends the ALJ erred in evaluating his credibility. Dkt. 13 at 3-6.
 18 Where, as here, there is no evidence of malingering, an ALJ must provide specific, clear and
 19 convincing reasons for rejecting a claimant’s testimony. *Molina v. Astrue*, 674 F.3d 1104, 1112
 20 (9th Cir. 2012); *accord Burrell v. Colvin*, 775 F.3d 1133, 1136 (9th Cir. 2014). “In weighing a
 21 claimant’s credibility, the ALJ may consider his reputation for truthfulness, inconsistencies
 22 either in his testimony or between his testimony and his conduct, his daily activities, his work

23 ¹ 20 C.F.R. §§ 404.1520, 416.920.

1 record, and testimony from physicians and third parties concerning the nature, severity, and
 2 effect of the symptoms of which he complains.” *Light v. Social Sec. Admin.*, 119 F.3d 789, 792
 3 (9th Cir. 1997).

4 **1. *Inconsistent Statements***

5 The ALJ discounted Mr. Wilcowski’s credibility because he made inconsistent
 6 statements. Tr. 25. This is a valid basis for discounting a claimant’s credibility under this
 7 Circuit’s case law. *See, e.g., Smolen v. Chater*, 80 F.3d 1273, 1284 (9th Cir. 1996) (ALJ may
 8 consider ordinary techniques of credibility evaluation, including inconsistent statements, in
 9 weighing a claimant’s credibility). The ALJ’s reasoning is also supported in fact. For example,
 10 in March 2013, Mr. Wilcowski told his provider that he was the product of a family rape,
 11 however, that information was not repeated to other providers. Tr. 25 (citing Tr. 400). The
 12 Commissioner observes that the information is absent “event during psychological exams where
 13 [Mr. Wilcowski] was recounting his family history.” Dkt 14 at 5 (citing Tr. 362-63).

14 The ALJ also found that Mr. Wilcowski provided inconsistent statements regarding a
 15 history of special education, sometimes indicating he had been in special education in high
 16 school, and other times stating he did not attend special education classes. *Compare* Tr. 362,
 17 398, 586, 595 *with* Tr. 269. Although the Court is not convinced that any more need be shown
 18 other than that Mr. Wilcowski’s statements were inconsistent, *see Smolen*, 80 F.3d at 1284, the
 19 Court acknowledges Mr. Wilcowski’s argument that an ALJ’s credibility assessment must relate
 20 to a claimant’s alleged impairments. *See* Dkt. 13 at 3. The Court observes that inconsistent
 21 statements regarding special education are relevant to Mr. Wilcowski’s severe impairment of
 22 ADHD. *See* Tr. 22.

23 The ALJ also noted Mr. Wilcowski offered conflicting reasons for being unable to work.

1 Though he testified he was unable to work due to mental health issues, he told a provider in 2014
2 that he had been unable to work for three years because he has pain when he tries to do physical
3 labor. Tr. 25 (citing Tr. 595). Even so, the ALJ observed, Mr. Wilcowski denied physical
4 limitations during a mental health evaluation in 2011. *Id.* (citing 582). Mr. Wilcowski's reports
5 about physical limitations limiting his ability to work are also relevant to his credibility
6 assessment because they are inconsistent with his allegations that he is unable to work due to
7 mental limitations.

8 The ALJ also noted that, though Mr. Wilcowski reported his wife was on SSI, he testified
9 that his wife was retired. Tr. 25. The Court need not determine whether this reasoning was valid
10 or invalid, however, because the ALJ gave other valid reasons, supported by substantial
11 evidence, for discounting Mr. Wilcowski's testimony.

12 **2. *Mental Status Examinations***

13 The ALJ also discounted Mr. Wilcowski's credibility because his Mental Status
14 Examinations (MSEs) were "mostly within normal limits" despite allegations of disabling mood
15 and anger problems. Tr. 25-26. The ALJ first identified a February 2012 evaluation, stating Mr.
16 Wilcowski was "pleasant and had normal mood and affect" on MSE. Tr. 26 (citing Tr. 360-61).
17 Mr. Wilcowski contends the ALJ erred because the citation does not include a MSE. Dkt. 13 at
18 4. The Court agrees. In this case, the citation contains only a physical examination with a single
19 entry for "Psych" that states, "NI mood and affect." Tr. 361.

20 The ALJ next cited a June 2012 MSE that is largely unremarkable. Tr. 587-88. Mr.
21 Wilcowski does not address this MSE.

22 The ALJ also discussed a March 2013 MSE that indicated Mr. Wilcowski was well-
23 groomed, completely oriented, had normal speech, displayed good eye contact, had normal body

1 movement without psychomotor agitation, had fair insight and judgment, had intact thoughts and
2 memory, and denied suicidal or homicidal ideation, but he had a depressed mood and affect. Tr.
3 26 (citing Tr. 476). Mr. Wilcowski does not dispute these findings, but argues instead that the
4 citation contains no MSE. Dkt. 13 at 4. While the evaluation does not specifically identify the
5 provider's findings as a "Mental Status Exam," the content suggests that is exactly what the
6 findings are. *See* 476. The ALJ did not err in relying on these findings to challenge Mr.
7 Wilcowski's allegations of disabling mood allegations.

8 Mr. Wilcowski contends a later MSE was "far from unremarkable" because, among other
9 things, he had moderately impaired concentration, little to no insight, mildly impaired social
10 judgment, violent thoughts, and he presented with suicidal and homicidal ideation. Dkt. 13 at 4
11 (citing Tr. 403-04). The ALJ did not discuss these findings and stated only that the MSE
12 demonstrated he was "cooperative and fully oriented. He had euthymic mood and appropriate
13 affect." Tr. 26. Similarly, the ALJ did not discuss the portion of a May 2013 MSE that indicated
14 Mr. Wilcowski endorsed mood swings, depression, irritability and anger, and "some general SI,"
15 and his affect was anxious. *Compare* Tr. 26. with Tr. 398. Mr. Wilcowski also challenges the
16 ALJ's reliance on what appears to be an incomplete MSE in January 2014 which found, in its
17 entirety, that he was alert, cooperative, not anxious, and "speaks in a loud voice at times came up
18 close to speak face to face." *See* Tr. 409.

19 Though it is true that the MSEs depict a somewhat mixed mental health status, the ALJ
20 erred because she failed to discuss the portions of the MSEs that are favorable to Mr.
21 Wilcowski's position. The Court therefore has no basis for evaluating if the ALJ erred in finding
22 the MSE were "mostly within normal limits." The Court "require[s] the ALJ to build an accurate
23 and logical bridge from the evidence to her conclusions so that we may afford the claimant

1 meaningful review of the SSA’s ultimate findings.” *Blakes v. Barnhart*, 331 F.3d 565, 569 (7th
 2 Cir. 2003). Accordingly, this was not a valid basis for discounting Mr. Wilcowski’s credibility.

3 ***3. Criminal History***

4 The ALJ also found that Mr. Wilcowski’s testimony regarding anger and outbursts was
 5 inconsistent with the record on the basis that Mr. Wilcowski “has no criminal history as would
 6 be expected if he truly had such issues.” Tr. 26. The Commissioner contends this is “simply a
 7 common sense conclusion.” Dkt. 14 at 7. There is no question it is a conclusion, but there is
 8 nothing common sense about it—particularly as a basis for discounting a claimant’s credibility.
 9 Under this analysis, the testimony of a large portion of claimants alleging mental health
 10 limitations would be validly rejected merely because there is an absence of a criminal record.
 11 This reasoning cannot stand and the Court rejects it without reservation.

12 ***4. Inconsistent Activities***

13 The ALJ also found Mr. Wilcowski’s ability to spend time with his wife, shop for
 14 groceries, cook, drive, go to Goodwill, go fishing with his brother, spend time with his children,
 15 play games, go to the movies, and walk on the beach was “inconsistent with disability.” A
 16 claimant’s reported daily activities can form the basis for an adverse credibility determination if
 17 they consist of activities that contradict the claimant’s “other testimony”; or that are transferable
 18 to a work setting.” *Orn v. Astrue*, 495 F.3d 625, 639 (9th Cir. 2007); *Smolen*, 80 F.3d at 1284
 19 n.7; *see also Reddick v. Chater*, 157 F.3d 715, 722 (9th Cir. 1998) (“Only if the level of activity
 20 were inconsistent with Claimant’s claimed limitations would these activities have any bearing on
 21 Claimant’s credibility”); *see also Light*, 119 F.3d at 792. Here, the erred because she failed to
 22 identify what testimony was undermined by Mr. Wilcowski’s activities. *See Lester v. Chater*, 81
 23 F.3d 821, 834 (9th Cir. 1996) (“General findings are insufficient; rather, the ALJ must identify

1 what testimony is not credible and what evidence undermines the claimant's complaints.”)

2 **5. Secondary Gain Motivation**

3 Finally, the ALJ questioned Mr. Wilcowski’s credibility because the record contained
 4 evidence of secondary gain motivation. Tr. 26 (citing Tr. 586). In June 2012, Mr. Wilcowski
 5 told a provider “I am not looking for work because what I really want is to be on SSI. If I don’t
 6 get it I guess I’ll have to go look for work again with no money for gas it would be kinda hard to
 7 look.” Tr. 586. Mr. Wilcowski contends “it is axiomatic that claimants seeking disability
 8 benefits are motivated by pecuniary gain,” and that his statement to the provider “does not mean
 9 he is able to sustain full time employment.” Dkt. 13 at 6. Mr. Wilcowski then points to
 10 conflicting statements he made about why he is not currently employed. Dkt. 15 at 3. But an
 11 ALJ properly considers motivation and issues of secondary gain in rejecting symptom testimony.
 12 *See Tidwell v. Apfel*, 161 F.3d 599, 602 (9th Cir. 1998). Record evidence supports the ALJ’s
 13 inference here, even if that evidence conflicts with Mr. Wilcowski’s other statements. *See*
 14 *Sample v. Schweiker*, 694 F.2d 639, 642 (9th Cir. 1982) (An ALJ is entitled to draw inferences
 15 “logically flowing from the evidence.”); *see also Magallanes v. Bowen*, 881 F.2d 747, 750 (9th
 16 Cir. 1989) (determinations of credibility, resolution of conflicts in medical testimony and all
 17 other ambiguities are to be resolved by the ALJ). The Court finds the reasoning was specific,
 18 clear and convincing.

19 In summary, the ALJ provided some valid and some invalid reasons for discounting Mr.
 20 Wilcowski’s testimony. Nevertheless, the ALJ’s valid reasons are not negated by the inclusion
 21 of erroneous reasons, and Mr. Wilcowski has failed to establish that the ALJ’s valid reasons for
 22 discounting his credibility are erroneous. Because any errors in the ALJ’s credibility findings
 23 are harmless, *see See Carmickle v. Comm’r, Soc. Sec. Admin.*, 533 F.3d 1155, 1162-63 (9th Cir.

1 2008), the Court declines to disturb the ALJ's credibility finding.

2 **B. The ALJ Erred in Evaluating Some Of the Medical and Other Opinion Evidence**

3 Mr. Wilcowski argues the ALJ misevaluated the opinions of providers David T. Morgan,
4 Ph.D.; Jan Kouzes, Ed.D.; Dana Harmon, Ph.D.; CeCilia Cooper, Ph.D.; and Ryan Lehotay,
5 LMHC. The ALJ must give specific and legitimate reasons for rejecting a treating or examining
6 doctor's opinion that is contradicted by another doctor, and clear and convincing reasons for
7 rejecting a treating or examining doctor's uncontradicted opinion. *Lester*, 81 F.3d at 830. The
8 Court may set aside the ALJ's decision if the ALJ's findings are based on legal error or are not
9 supported by substantial evidence in the record as a whole. *Bayliss v. Barnhart*, 427 F.3d 1211,
10 1214 n.1 (9th Cir. 2005).

11 **1. David T. Morgan, Ph.D.**

12 Mr. Wilcowski challenges the ALJ's assignment of only "limited weight" to the opinion
13 of David Morgan, Ph.D. Dkt. 13 at 7. Dr. Morgan opined Mr. Wilcowski had marked
14 limitations in tasks relating to memory, maintaining a schedule, requiring adaptability,
15 communicating, maintaining appropriate behavior, setting goals, and completing work without
16 interruptions from psychologically-based symptoms. Tr. 597. The doctor conducted a Mental
17 Status Exam and observed Mr. Wilcowski had depressed mood and impaired memory. Tr. 598-
18 99. He also conducted a clinical interview. *See id.* The ALJ rejected the opinion because it
19 relied on Mr. Wilcowski's unreliable self-reports and because the provider did "no objective
20 testing." Tr. 27. The finding is not accurate. An ALJ does not provide valid reasons for rejecting
21 an examining physician's opinion "by questioning the credibility of the patient's complaints where
22 the doctor does not discredit those complaints and supports his ultimate opinion with his own
23 observations." *Ryan v. Comm'r, Soc. Sec. Admin.*, 528 F.3d 1194, 1199-1200 (9th Cir. 2008).

1 Furthermore, there is no reason a doctor cannot rely on both objective testing and a claimant's
2 subjective reports in forming his medical opinions.

3 The ALJ also rejected the opinion because the doctor used a "checkbox form." Tr. 27.
4 Though it is true a doctor's opinion may be discounted when it is in the form of a checklist, the same
5 is not true when the opinion also contains supportive objective evidence. *See Batson v.*
6 *Commissioner*, 359 F.3d 1190, 1195 (9th Cir. 2004).

7 Finally, the ALJ rejected Dr. Morgan's opinions because he indicated Mr. Wilcowski was
8 only limited for a six month duration. Tr. 27. It is not entirely clear why the ALJ found this was
9 a reasonable basis to reject the doctor's opinion. Under the twelve-month durational requirement
10 set forth in 42 U.S.C. § 423(d)(1)(A), the term "disability" means "the inability to engage in any
11 substantial gainful activity by reason of any medically determinable physical or mental
12 impairment which can be expected to result in death or which has lasted or which can be
13 expected to last for a continuous period of not less than 12 months." Thus, while the doctor's
14 finding may speak to the *severity* of Mr. Wilcowski's limitations, the ALJ failed to explain how
15 the finding may be used to reject a medical opinion entirely. The Court declines to intuit what
16 the ALJ may have been thinking. *See Bray v. Comm'r, Soc. Sec. Admin.*, 554 F.3d 1219, 1225–
17 26 (9th Cir. 2009).

18 The ALJ's reasons for rejecting Dr. Morgan's opinions were neither legitimate nor
19 convincing. On remand, the opinion should be reevaluated.

20 **2. Jan Kouzes, Ed.D.**

21 Dr. Kouzes completed evaluations of Mr. Wilcowski based on MSEs and clinical
22 interviews in December 2011 and June 2012. Tr. 585-88, 590-93. Dr. Kouzes noted she
23 observed Mr. Wilcowski's anger, and on mental status exam, Mr. Wilcowski was irritable,

1 depressed, had poor impulse control, and demonstrated denial/resistance. Tr. 590-92. On both
2 occasions, Dr. Kouzes opined Mr. Wilcowski was likely to be able to perform his past janitorial
3 duties, and in a supportive, mentored work environment, he “may be able to sustain a job.” Tr.
4 587, 592.

5 The ALJ gave “little weight” to the opinions because the provider estimated Mr.
6 Wilcowski’s impairment at six months. For the reasons discussed above, this reasoning is not
7 valid. *See Section B.1, supra.* However, the ALJ also rejected the opinions because the provider
8 “reviewed no records and observed no symptoms (except anger in 2011 but he provided no
9 description to support).” Tr. 27. The ALJ further found that “nothing in the examinations
10 suggest the claimant would need a supportive mentored work environment.” *Id.* A physician’s
11 opinion may be discounted when it does not have supportive objective evidence and when it is
12 “conclusory, brief, and unsupported by the record as a whole . . . or by objective medical
13 findings[.]” *Batson*, 359 F.3d at 1195. The Court finds it was not unreasonable for the ALJ to
14 conclude that the provider’s opinion regarding the ability to sustain employment, without
15 explanation, was unsupported. The inclusion of any invalid reasons does not affect the validity
16 of the ALJ’s ultimate conclusion. *See Batson*, 359 F.3d at 1197. Accordingly, the Court
17 recommends affirming the ALJ’s decision with respect to Dr. Kouzes’s opinions.

18 **3. *Dana Harmon, Ph.D.***

19 Non-examining state-agency consultant Dana Harmon completed a psychological
20 evaluation in January 2014. Tr. 600. She assessed a number of marked mental limitations and a
21 Global Assessment of Functioning (GAF), depression, and mood instability severity rating score
22 of three. Tr. 601-02. Dr. Harmon provided no explanation for her findings. *See id.* The ALJ
23 accorded the opinion “no weight,” because 1) Dr. Harmon was not an examining source; 2) she

1 provided no explanation for her check-the-box assessment; and 3) her opinion was inconsistent
2 with mental status exam findings. Tr. 27.

3 Medical opinions are statements from acceptable medical sources that reflect judgments
4 about the nature and severity of a claimant's impairments. 20 CFR §§ 404.1527(a)(2),
5 416.927(a)(2). Opinions from non-examining sources must also be considered. The ALJ thus
6 erred in rejecting the opinion because it was from a non-examining source. The ALJ also erred
7 in rejecting the opinion as inconsistent with the MSE findings, because the ALJ's evaluation of
8 those findings was flawed, as discussed above. *See Section A.2, supra.* However, the ALJ did
9 not err in rejecting the opinion because no explanation was provided for the doctor's check-the-
10 box conclusions. *See Batson*, 359 F.3d at 1195; *see also* Tr. 601-02. Because the ALJ's invalid
11 reasons do not negate the valid reason she provided for rejecting the opinion, *Batson*, 359 F.3d at
12 1197, the Court recommends affirming the ALJ's decision with respect to Dr. Harmon's opinion.

13 **4. *Cecilia Cooper, Ph.D.***

14 The ALJ assigned "great weight" to Dr. Cooper's opinion, including her opinion that Mr.
15 Wilcowski would need a moderate level of supervision to ensure he completes tasks and that he
16 would have occasional problems with supervisors. Tr. 28 (citing Tr. 367). Mr. Wilcowski
17 contends the ALJ erred in failing to incorporate that portion of the opinion in his RFC
18 determination, which, he contends, would have required reconciling a conflict between requiring
19 supervision but having problems with supervisors. Dkt. 13 at 16.

20 The ALJ assessed an RFC that limited Mr. Wilcowski to "occasional superficial
21 interaction with the general public and coworkers." Tr. 24. These limitations do not address
22 interactions with supervisors. The Commissioner argues the ALJ's limitation to simple, routine,
23 and repetitive tasks takes into account the need for supervision when performing "more

1 complicated tasks.” Dkt. 14 at 13. The argument is unsupported and unpersuasive. Dr. Cooper
2 separately opined Mr. Wilcowski could understand, remember, and carry out instructions for
3 tasks involving two or three unrelated steps. Tr. 367. The Court therefore agrees that the
4 limitations were not incorporated into Mr. Wilcowski’s RFC, despite the ALJ’s assignment of
5 “great weight” to Dr. Cooper’s opinion. Furthermore, the ALJ provided no explanation which
6 would support the Commissioner’s interpretation. An RFC by the ALJ “must always consider
7 and address medical source opinions. If the RFC assessment conflicts with an opinion from a
8 medical source, the adjudicator must explain why the opinion was not adopted.” *See* SSR 96-8p.
9 In addition, the ALJ “must explain why significant probative evidence has been rejected.”
10 *Vincent on Behalf of Vincent v. Heckler*, 739 F.2d 1393, 1394-95 (9th Cir. 1984). The ALJ
11 failed to do so. On remand, Dr. Cooper’s opinion should be reevaluated and the ALJ should
12 specifically explain why portions of the opinion, if adopted, were not incorporated into Mr.
13 Wilcowski’s RFC.

14 **5. Ryan Lehotay, LMHC**

15 The ALJ assigned “little weight” to the March 2014 opinion of Ryan Lehotay, LMHC.
16 Tr. 27-28. Mr. Lehotay provided ongoing therapy to treat Mr. Wilcowski’s bipolar disorder. Tr.
17 603. The provider indicated he assessed Mr. Wilcowski’s mental health using the World Health
18 Organization Disability Assessment Schedule 2.0, and that Mr. Wilcowski’s scores were
19 “consistent with clinical observation” and with a severe level of disability. *Id.* Mr. Lehotay
20 identified a number of symptoms suffered by Mr. Wilcowski, including severely depressed
21 mood, suicidal ideation, lack of motivation, destructive in relationships, sudden shifts in mood,
22 and difficulties in memory and concentration. *Id.* Mr. Lehotay noted Mr. Wilcowski
23 decompensates several times per week. *Id.* Mr. Lehotay concluded that Mr. Wilcowski’s

1 “intolerance to stress, instability of his moods, and frequency of decompensation would be very
 2 problematic for potential employers especially in regard to the expected consistency of
 3 performance and reliability.” *Id.*

4 Mental health care providers such as Mr. Lehotay are considered “other medical
 5 sources,” whose opinions can be rejected only upon providing reasons germane to that witness.
 6 *Molina*, 674 F.3d at 1111. The ALJ rejected the opinion because Mr. Lehotay “is not an
 7 acceptable medical source,” the opinion was based “quite heavily” on Mr. Wilcowski’s
 8 subjective complaints, and because Mr. Wilcowski’s mental status exam findings are “mostly
 9 within normal limits.” Tr. 28. The ALJ erred in rejecting Mr. Lehotay’s opinion. Other medical
 10 source opinions can only be rejected for germane reasons; the fact that the opinion comes from
 11 an “other” source is not one of them. Additionally, there is no basis to believe the opinion was
 12 based “quite heavily” on Mr. Wilcowski’s complaints — Mr. Lehotay stated he utilized a WHO
 13 assessment, the findings of which were consistent with clinical observations. Tr. 603.
 14 Additionally, as the Court discussed above, the ALJ failed to recognize portions of Mr.
 15 Wilcowski’s MSEs that suggested his mental status was not within normal limits. *See* Section
 16 A.2, *supra*. The ALJ thus could not rely on her own conclusions as evidence that Mr. Lehotay’s
 17 findings conflicted with the record. The Court thus recommends the opinion be reevaluated on
 18 remand.

19 **C. The ALJ Did Not Err in Evaluating the Lay Witness Testimony of Patricia
 Wilcowski**

20 Mr. Wilcowski next challenges the ALJ’s assignment of “minimal weight” to the ALJ’s
 21 assessment of his wife’s third-party function report. Dkt. 13 at 16. The ALJ rejected Ms.
 22 Wilcowski’s statements because he found she had a personal interest in Mr. Wilcowski’s benefits
 23 because he owes her support. Tr. 27. The ALJ also rejected the report because Ms. Wilcowski’s

1 statement that Mr. Wilcowski could not maintain employment due to concentration problems
 2 was inconsistent with the record regarding his employment history and the length he held prior
 3 jobs. *Id.* The Commissioner offers no substantive argument, essentially parroting the ALJ's
 4 findings. Dkt. 14 at 9-10.

5 Ms. Wilcowski is also considered an "other source" under the Social Security regulations,
 6 and therefore the ALJ may only reject her opinion for "germane" reasons. *See* 20 C.F.R. §§
 7 404.1513(a) and (d), SSR 06-03p; *Molina*, 674 F.3d at 1111. The ALJ offered no support for her
 8 conclusion that Ms. Wilcowski's statements were motivated by secondary gain. A conclusion
 9 based on speculation cannot stand. However, it was not unreasonable for the ALJ to conclude
 10 the record did not support the reasons Ms. Wilcowski offered for Mr. Wilcowski's difficulty
 11 maintaining employment. Mr. Wilcowski reported working for employers for 2-5 years; he was
 12 fired because of his "mouth and attitude," there were "problems if [he] didn't like somebody," he
 13 was "in the wrong place at the wrong time," he had pain when he tried to do physical labor, or he
 14 simply left because he felt "burnt out." Tr. 364, 586, 591, 595. Accordingly, the ALJ provided
 15 at least one reason germane to Ms. Wilcowski for rejecting her opinion. The decision should be
 16 affirmed.

17 CONCLUSION

18 For the foregoing reasons, the Court recommends that the Commissioner's decision be
 19 **REVERSED** and the case be **REMANDED** for further administrative proceedings under
 20 sentence four of 42 U.S.C. § 405(g).

21 On remand, the ALJ should reevaluate the opinions of Dr. Morgan, Ph.D.; Ryan Lehotay,
 22 LMHC; and Dr. Cooper, Ph.D. If the opinions are adopted, the ALJ should specifically explain
 23 why any portions may not be incorporated into Mr. Wilcowski's RFC.

1 A proposed order accompanies this Report and Recommendation. Any objection to this
2 Report and Recommendation must be filed and served no later than **July 22, 2016**. If no
3 objections are filed, the Clerk shall note the matter for July 25, 2016 as ready for the Court's
4 consideration. If objections are filed, any response is due within 14 days after being served with
5 the objections. A party filing an objection must note the matter for the Court's consideration 14
6 days from the date the objection is filed and served. Objections and responses shall not exceed
7 ten pages. The failure to timely object may affect the right to appeal.

8 DATED this 8th day of July, 2016.

9
10 
11 BRIAN A. TSUCHIDA
12 United States Magistrate Judge
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23